Case 4:17-cv-04006-JST Document 249-26 Filed 10/14/20 Page 1 of 6

## **EXHIBIT** F

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

REARDEN LLC, REARDEN MOVA LLC, )
California limited liability )
companies, )

Plaintiffs, )

vs. ) No. 4:17

No. 4:17-cv-04006-JST 4:17-cv-04191-JST

THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY, a )
Delaware corporation, WALT )
DISNEY MOTION PICTURES GROUP, )
INC., a California )
corporation, BUENA VISTA HOME )
ENTERTAINMENT, INC., a )
California corporation, MARVEL )
STUDIOS, LLC, a Delaware )
limited liability company, )
MANDEVILLE FILMS, INC., a )
California corporation, )

Defendants.

-- complete caption on next page --

CONFIDENTIAL DEPOSITION OF MIMI STEELE, taken on behalf of the Plaintiffs, at 350 South Grand Avenue, 50th floor, Los Angeles, California, commencing at 10:09 A.M., on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, pursuant to Subpoena, before MICHELLE MURTAGH, CSR No. 13975, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, in and for the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

\* \* \*

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
4	
5	REARDEN LLC, REARDEN MOVA LLC, )
6	California limited liability ) companies,
7	Plaintiffs, )
8	vs. ) No. 4:17-cv-04006-JST ) 4:17-cv-04191-JST
9	THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY, a ) Delaware corporation, WALT )
10	DISNEY MOTION PICTURES GROUP, ) INC., a California )
11	corporation, BUENA VISTA HOME ) ENTERTAINMENT, INC., a )
12	California corporation, MARVEL ) STUDIOS, LLC, a Delaware )
13	limited liability company, ) MANDEVILLE FILMS, INC., a )
14	California corporation, )
15	Defendants. )
16	REARDEN LLC and REARDEN MOVA )
17	LLC,
18	Plaintiffs, )
19	vs. )
20	TWENTIETH CENTURY FOX FILM )  CORPORATION, a Delaware )
21	corporation, a Delaware ) corporation and TWENTIETH ) CENTURY FOX HOME ENTERTAINMENT )
22	LLC, a Delaware limited )
23	liability company, ) )
24	Defendants. ) )
25	

1 material that is captured gets translated and can then 2 be used by the animator to then go in and animate more 3 on top of that. 4 Q. Let's just take a step back then. Was the 5 Disney production team going to capture Dan Stevens 6 performance as the Beast, his facial performance? 7 Α. Yes. What technology were they going to use to do 8 Ο. that? 10 Α. We were going to use Medusa. 11 And did that, in fact, happen? Ο. 12 Α. No. 13 Why didn't you end up using Medusa? Q. 14 Α. Digital Domain suggested MOVA. 15 Q. Okay. 16 When we went to Digital Domain. Α. 17 Okay. So ILM's Medusa had a facial capture Ο. 18 technology and Digital Domain had a facial capture 19 technology and you went with Digital Domain? 20 Α. Yes. 21 And I guess getting back to what you and I Q. 22 have been struggling a little bit with here, it wasn't a 23 concern with Frame Store or Double Negative whether or 24 not they had Facial Performance Capture technology 25 because you could use Medusa; right?

1 Α. Yes, or we could use any other number of 2 facial captures. 3 Ο. And so let me just ask you: Why is it that you ended up choosing Digital Domain over ILM's Medusa? 4 We didn't choose it over ILM's Medusa. Α. chose Digital Domain because of their Direct Drive and 6 7 also because Kelly Port and how he connected with the 8 director. So you originally contemplated using Medusa Ο. 10 for Facial Performance Capture and you decided instead 11 to go with Digital Domain's technology for the reasons 12 you just related to me? 13 No. We -- "we" being Steve, myself, Jeff, and Α. 14 Bill went with ILM in the beginning. They were going to 15 use Medusa. That wasn't the reason why we chose ILM, 16 and then clearly could tell that they were not 17 connecting creatively with our director, so we were 18 looking at other options, and the other option being DD. 19 Direct Drive was attractive and Kelly Port was also one of the selling points for Bill. 20 21 Q. Okay. Good. Yep. That was my question. 2.2 Had you personally worked with Facial 23 Performance Capture before "Beauty and the Beast"? 24 Not on any of my previous films. Α. 25 Q. So I want to touch back on something you just

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA ) ) ss. 2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 3 I, MICHELLE MURTAGH, CSR No. 13975, a court 4 5 reporter for the County of Los Angeles, State of 6 California, do hereby certify; 7 That prior to being examined, MIMI STEELE, the witness named in the foregoing deposition, was by me 8 duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth, and 9 10 nothing but the truth; 11 That said deposition was taken before me at 12 the time and place herein set forth, and was taken by me 13 in shorthand and thereafter transcribed into typewriting 14 under my direction and supervision, and I hereby certify 15 that the said deposition is a full, true and correct 16 transcript of my shorthand notes so taken; that a review of the transcript by the deponent was requested. 17 18 I further certify that I am neither counsel 19 for nor related to any party to said action, nor in any 20 way interested in the outcome thereof. 21 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereto subscribe my name 2.2 this 26th day of March, 2020. 23 24 Certified Shorthand Reporter in 25 and for the County of Los Angeles, State of California